

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

JOHN MATTHEW BANDY,  
#02310772,

Plaintiff,

v.

TDCJ BOARD,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:20-cv-509-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff John Bandy, a prisoner within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition.


On December 9, 2020, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff's civil rights action be dismissed, without prejudice, for Plaintiff's failure to comply with an order of the Court. Docket No. 16. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff. Plaintiff filed a response indicating that he "is in agreement with the Report and Recommendation," but requesting that the Court waive the filing fee in this case. Docket No. 17. However, the Report recommends dismissing this case because Plaintiff has failed to amend his complaint as ordered, despite an extension of time to do so. Docket Nos. 7, 14, 16. Plaintiff does not address this issue in his response.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 16) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for Plaintiff's failure to comply with an order of the Court.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 13th day of **January, 2021**.

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE